REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 22, 2006. Claims 1-25 were pending in that action and all claims were rejected. With the present response, claims 1-4 and 14-16 are amended. The remaining claims are unchanged.

In the Office Action, the Examiner didn't indicate one way or the other whether Applicant's drawings have been accepted. Approval of the drawings is respectfully solicited.

Beginning on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by an article by Lee (hereinafter referred to as "the Lee reference").

With the present response, independent claim 1 has been amended to limit the strings to which the claimed method steps are applied to being "linguistic help query strings". It is respectfully pointed out that the cited Lee reference makes absolutely no teaching or suggestion as to the processing of a log of linguistic help query strings. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is in allowable form.

Further, independent claim 1 recites a method of compressing a log of linguistic data. The method includes applying a compression operation to each of a plurality of linguistic help query strings in the log. In response, the Examiner points to a "pre-processing" step described in the Lee reference. In Section 4 of the reference, the pre-processing step is described as including data type checks and format standardization. Notably, these are transforming operations and not compression operation as claimed. Lee also describes pre-processing as including resolving inconsistencies in abbreviations and other standardized representations. Again, this is not a compression operation. In fact, all of the pre-processing operations described by Lee have the potential of expansion rather than compression.

In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that some examples in Applicant's specification are similar to the pre-processing steps described in the Lee reference. For example, Applicant describes case normalization. However, Applicant does describe other operations that are neither taught nor suggested in the Lee reference. Some of these other operations are removing excess spaces from strings (page 12), removing frequent grammatical function words (page 12), folding synonyms into a single canonical semantic term (page 12), reducing inflected

words to their linguistic base form (page 12) and removing terms based on subsumption (pages 13 and 14). Thus, Applicant's provides many examples of the application of compression operations prior to removing strings from the log. The Lee reference provides no such teaching or suggestion. This is an additional reason in support of the allowability of claim 1.

Claim 6 is dependent upon claim 1 and believed to be in allowable form at least for the same reasons described above in relation to its affiliated independent claim.

Beginning on page 4 of the Office Action, dependent claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lee reference in view of an article by Ling (hereinafter referred to as "the Ling reference"). Claims 2-4 are dependent upon independent claim 1 and are believed to be in allowable form at least for the same reasons discussed above in relation to that independent claim. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4 each recite limitations that are independently distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 2-4 emphasize the fact that the claimed "strings" being processed are inputs into a help interface (claim 2), queries relative to a help function (claim 3), or help-related queries relative to a computer system (claim 4). In response, the Examiner points to the Ling reference. However, the Ling reference simply describes processing relative to Internet queries. The teachings of the Ling reference have absolutely nothing to do with help-oriented queries. This is an additional reason in support of the allowability of claims 2-4.

Beginning on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 14-16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C.§103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lee reference in view of the Ling reference. Of these claims, claim 14 is independent and the remaining claims are dependent thereon. Claim 14 is similar to claim 1 in that it defines application of a compression operation to each of a plurality of linguistic help query strings in a query log. As was described above in relation to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the Lee reference fails to teach or suggest applying any compression operation as claimed. Further, it is respectfully submitted that neither the Lee nor Ling reference teaches or describes any system that involves processing of help-oriented content. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 14

is in allowable form. Claims 15, 16 and 18 are dependent upon independent claim 14 and are believed to be allowable at least for the same reasons as stated above in relation to their affiliated independent claim. Further, claims 15 and 16 are also believed to be allowable because they pertain to the processing of help-related query data, which the cited references do not.

Beginning on page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 5 and 17 under 35 U.S.C.§103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lee reference in view of a reference by Blake (hereinafter referred to as "the Blake reference"). It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims, which are dependent upon independent claims 1 and 14, are in allowable form at least for the same reasons described herein in relation to their respective independent claims. Further, it is worth pointing out that the Blake reference describes removing stop words in a text-processing context. In contrast, the Lee reference describes processing of data records. One must question what a "stop word" would be in the context of the data records described in the Lee reference. In fact, it would make little sense to perform the Blake process in the context of the Lee reference. For this additional reason, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 17 are allowable in their present form.

Beginning on page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 7, 8, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lee reference in view of an article by Yang (hereinafter referred to as "the Yang reference"). It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims, which depend on independent claims 1 and 14, are in allowable form at least for the same reasons discussed above in relation to their respective independent claims.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that at least some of claim 7, 8 and 19 and 20 are in patentable form based on the merit of their own claim limitations. For example, claims 8 and 20 recite application of an impossibility condition to selectively compute edit distance. In response, the Examiner points to the Yang reference at page 123, right column. This passage describes application of an algorithm for calculating field similarity. However, there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of application of any impossibility condition as claimed. For this additional reason, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 20 are in patentable form. These

are just examples of dependent claims that are believed to be in allowable form based on the merits of their own claim limitations.

Beginning on page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 9-13 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lee reference in view of an article by Fayyad (hereinafter referred to as "the Fayyad reference"). It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims, which are dependent upon independent claims 1 and 14, are in allowable form at least for the same reasons discussed above in relation to their respective independent claims. This is not to say; however, that these dependent claims are not patentable based on the merits of their own claim limitations. In fact, such additional reasons for allowability do exist.

For example, dependent claim 9 recites applying a second compression operation to each linguistic help query string. In response, the Examiner points to the Fayyad reference at page 42, left column, lines 1-33. A close examination of this passage, and indeed the entire reference, reveals that there is absolutely no teaching of the application of multiple compression operations prior to removing matching strings from a query log as claimed. Also, the proposed combination is questionable because the Lee reference describes or suggests no application of a compression operation at all.

Claim 12 specifically defines the second application of a compression operation as being application of a subsumption operation. In response, the Examiner points to page 42, left column, lines 1-33. However, there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of multiple compression operations, let alone a subsumption operation as claimed. These are just examples of dependent claims that are believed to be in allowable form based on the merits of their own limitations.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: _____

Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:rkp